

**THE ABILITY OF ELEVENTH GRADE STUDENTS  
WRITING HORTATORY EXPOSITION TEXT  
AT MAN 1 PEKANBARU**

Deni Prasetyani, Rumiri Aruan, Novitri  
deniprasetyani7@gmail.com, rumiri.aruan@lecturer.unri.ac.id, novitri\_11@yahoo.com  
Contac Person: 082386672475

*English Study Program,  
Teachers Training and Education Faculty  
Riau University*

**Abstract:** *The aim of this research is to investigate the level of the eleventh grade students' ability of MAN 1 Pekanbaru in writing hortatory exposition text. The research design is a descriptive quantitative research. There were 32 students chosen as the samples of this research and it was from XI Science 4 class. The instrument of this research was a writing test analyzed by using scoring system adapted from Anderson in Huges (1989) and the students' scores were matched with 'The Student Mastery Level' adapted from Harris (1974). The data show that there were no students who reached excellent level and 1 student (3.13%) was in very good level. Then, there were 13 students (40.63%) who were in good level and 10 students (31.25%) who were in fair level. Moreover, 7 students (21.88%) were in poor level and 1 student (3.13%) was in very poor level. From the collected data, it could be concluded that this eleventh grade students' ability level of MAN 1 Pekanbaru in writing hortatory exposition text was categorized into fair level. Besides, from the five writing indicators assessed, it was found that the students did the best in vocabulary and style with 3.51 as the average score and the students found it difficult in organization indicator (2.98).*

**Key Words:** *student, ability, writing, hortatory exposition*

**PENELITIAN TERHADAP KEMAMPUAN SISWA  
KELAS SEBELAS DALAM MENULIS TEKS  
HORTATORY EXPOSITION  
DI MAN 1 PEKANBARU**

Deni Prasetiani, Rumiri Aruan, Novitri

deniprasetiani7@gmail.com, rumiri.aruan@lecturer.unri.ac.id, novitri\_11@yahoo.com

Contac Person: 082386672475

Program Studi Bahasa Inggris,  
Fakultas Pendidikan dan Ilmu Pengetahuan  
Riau University

**Abstrak:** Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menginvestigasi tingkat kemampuan siswa kelas sebelas di MAN 1 Pekanbaru dalam menulis teks hortatory exposition. Metode penelitian yang digunakan adalah penelitian deskriptif kuantitatif. Ada 32 siswa terpilih menjadi sampel penelitian yang berasal dari kelas XI IPA 4. Instrumen penelitian ini adalah tes menulis yang dianalisa menggunakan system penilaian yang diadaptasi dari Anderson di Huges (1989) dan nilai-nilaisiswa dicocokkan menggunakan tingkat kemampuan siswa dari Harris (1974). Data tersebut menunjukkan tidak ada siswa berada di level unggul dan 1 siswa (3.13%) berada di level sangat baik. Kemudian, ada 13 siswa (40.63%) berada di level baik dan 10 siswa (31.25%) berada di level sedang. Di samping itu, 7 siswa (21.88%) di level lemah dan 1 siswa (3.13%) berada di level sangat lemah. Berdasarkan data tersebut, dapat disimpulkan bahwa kemampuan siswa kelas sebelas MAN 1 Pekanbaru dalam menulis teks hortatory exposition adalah di level sedang. Selainitu, dari lima indicator menulis yang diperiksa, dapat dilihat bahwa siswa-siswa memiliki kemampuan yang sangat baik pada indicator vocabulary and style dengan poin 3.51 sebagai nilai rata-rata dan siswa mengalami kesulitan pada indicator organization (2.98).

**Kata Kunci:** Siswa, Kemampuan, Menulis, Hortatory Exposition

## **BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY**

Writing is an important skill in learning language. People nowadays do not always have chance to speak to one another because they are busy to work so they are tempted to use today's technology like internet or letter for communication. People nowadays are also more literate that the needs of writing is getting higher and higher especially in education and job fields like making essay for scholarship, applying for jobs, finishing test such as TOEFL and IELTS, making report or article, etc.

According to School-Based Curriculum in 2006 (SBC), hortatory exposition is one of texts taught in eleventh grade students. Hortatory exposition is a text which its purpose is to persuade the reader or listener that something should or should not be the case (Gerot and Wignell, 1995). Approaching language in the perspective of texts according to Freeze & Joyce (2002) will enable students to deal with spoken and written texts in social context. In line with this research, SBC is assumed to have better possible outcomes in learning English.

Because hortatory exposition is one of argumentative texts, there are several benefits the students can get by learning it, they are: student personal needs and student educational needs. In the student personal needs, learning argumentation helps the students to train their critical thinking. Therefore, thoughts that he says or writes will not be bias instead of logical. In educational needs, there are some reasons why critical thinking will be beneficial. First, it helps the students to be better writers in class or out of class and better speakers in discussion or even presentation. Second, writing argumentative will be required in some tests like in TOEFL, IELTS, or test for getting scholarships for school or college in abroad. Last but not least, hortatory exposition is one of curriculum demands in learning English according to present-implemented curriculum which is School-Based Curriculum (SBC).

Then, while the writer was practicing as a pre-service teacher (PPL) in MAN 1 Pekanbaru especially eleventh grade students, the writer taught analytical exposition writing and the students seemed very interested when they were asked to give their ideas in particular cases since analytical exposition also requires writer's arguments. However, some of them were struggled while it came to reasoning on why and how their ideas could came up.

Considering the phenomena as described above, the writer was interested in conducting an investigation entitled "The Ability of Eleventh Grade Students in Writing Hortatory Exposition di MAN 1 Pekanbaru."

## **METHODOLOGY**

This research was conducted at class XI Science 4 of MAN 1Pekanbaru, on May 18<sup>th</sup>, 2016. This research belongs to descriptive research. Gay (2000) states, "A descriptive study determines and describes the ways things are." In addition, Nana Syaodih Sukmadinata (2011) defines descriptive research as a research method used to describe the present or past phenomena without manipulating or altering the free variables. In other words, descriptive research is a method to describe the condition or situation of something based on the real phenomena in the field.

The population of this research is the eleventh grade students of MAN I Pekanbaru in the Academic Year 2015/2016 which consists of 271 students in eight classes. Population is all members of human, animal, event, or thing live together in one place and intentionally becomes the conclusion target from the final result of the research, (Sukardi, 2003). Because the population is more than 100, according to Arikunto (2006) the sample taken is between 10%-15%. Therefore, the sample was 10% x 271 equals 27,1 or it could be regarded as 27 students. One class is sufficient as the sample used as each class consisted at least 27 students. A cluster random sampling procedure was used for selecting the sample in this study. The sample was obtained by writing out the names of the class on small pieces of papers, one paper was for one class name, and then it was folded and put into a basket. After thorough reshuffling, one fold was taken randomly and the name of the class written on the taken fold was going to be the sample of this research. In this random selection, XI Science 4 class which consisted of 32 students was obtained as the sample of the research.

Quantitative data was used in this research. The data was collected by giving test to the sample. The sample was asked to write a hortatory exposition text on a piece of paper. This text had been learned by the sample while they were being asked to write it. The sample could choose one of topics provided and write the text in 90 minutes or in a two-hour learning. Afterwards, the test was scored by three raters using rubric contains five writing components which each component has range score from 1 to 5. The writing components are: content and development, organization, sentence formatting and usage, vocabulary and style, and mechanic.

After all the students' writing has been scored by the raters, it was taken by the writer and its scores were calculated. The score calculation of writing indicators was done by using the following formula:

$$S = CD + O + SU + VS + M$$

With, S	= Students' score
CD	= Students' ability in content and development
O	= Students' ability in organization
SU	= Students' ability in sentence formatting and usage
VS	= Students' ability in vocabulary and style
M	= Students' ability in mechanic

The next step was finding out the student's mean score from the three raters. The students' scores have been acquired from each rater, afterwards, was gathered and calculated again to know each student's real score (RS) as final score by using the formula below:

$$RS = \text{Rater 1} + \text{Rater 2} + \text{Rater 3}$$

After the real score (RS) of the students has been calculated, it was matched with 'The Student Mastery Level' adapted from Harris (1974) to see each student mastery level in writing hortatory exposition. The classification of the student mastery level in writing hortatory exposition text can be described as follows:

**Table 1. The Student Mastery Level**

Range of Score	Grade
91-100	Excellent
81-90	Very Good
71-80	Good
61-70	Fair
51-60	Poor
Less than 50	Very Poor

Adapted from Harris (1974)

Subsequently, to get the percentage of the classification of the ability of the eleventh grade students of MAN 1 Pekanbaru in writing hortatory exposition, the formula below was used:

$$P = \frac{f}{N} \times 100\%$$

Where : P = Percentage  
 F = Frequency  
 N = The number of the students

(Hatch and Farhady, 1982)

In order to get the final result of all, each student's real score has been acquired was computed to find out their average score. Their scores were computed by using the following formula:

$$M_x = \frac{\Sigma X}{N}$$

Where :  $M_x$  = Mean  
 $\Sigma X$  = Total score of all students  
 N = The number of the students

(Sudijono, 2012)

The average score of all students was matched again with 'The Student Mastery Level' to know the conclusive result of this research.

## RESEARCH FINDINGS

As described before, the data collection was carried out at class XI Science 4 of MAN 1 Pekanbaru. There were 32 students who did the test. In this section, the writer presents the findings focusing on the students' ability in writing hortatory exposition

text. The students' ability level was discovered by matching their score with 'The Student Mastery Level' adapted from Harris (1974).

After the scores acquired from the three raters have been calculated, each student's average score and their mean score as a whole could be obtained. The following table describes the results of the test on the eleventh grade students' ability writing hortatory exposition.

**Table 2. The Percentage of the Students' Ability Level in Writing Hortatory Exposition**

The Score Range	The Level of Ability	Frequency	Percentage	Mean Score
91-100	Excellent	0	0 %	
81-90	Very Good	1	3.13%	
71-80	Good	13	40.63%	68.41
61-70	Fair	10	31.25%	(fair)
51-60	Poor	7	21.88%	
Less than 50	Very Poor	1	3.13%	
Total		32	100%	

Table 2 above shows the percentage of the students' ability in every level of writing hortatory exposition. From the table, it can be seen that the majority of students are in *good* and *fair* level. 40.63% of the students are in *good* level or having score ranging from 71-80 and 31.25% (10 students) are in *fair* level which means their score range is from 61-70. In *excellent* level, nonetheless, no one reaches this level and 3.13% of the samples (1 student) can reach *very good* level. Below *fair* level, as many as 21.88% (7 students) are still in *poor* level or having score ranging from 51-60 and the rest (1 student) is still in *very poor* level.

Next, it is also important to find out the students' average score in each indicator acquired from three raters to see in which indicator the students did best in writing hortatory exposition. After the average score of each indicator from each rater has been analyzed, the writer found out its average. The result of the calculation is demonstrated in Table 3 below.

**Table 3. The Average Scores of Each Indicator in Student Writing Hortatory Exposition Based on the Three Raters**

The Aspects of Writing	R1	R2	R3	The Average Score of the Indicators
Content and Development	3.28	3.31	3.72	3.43
Organization	2.91	2.56	3.47	2.98
Sentence Formatting and Usage	3.03	3.69	3.25	3.32
Vocabulary and Style	3.28	3.69	3.56	3.51
Mechanic	3.19	3.44	3.84	3.49

**Note:**

R1 = Rater 1

R2 = Rater 2

R3 = Rater 3

N = The Number of the students

According to the table demonstrated above, it can be seen that the students' average score of the indicator *content and development* in writing hortatory exposition based on the three raters is 3.43. It is neither the highest nor the lowest in the table. From this point, it can be seen that mostly the students have been able to write the content relevantly to the topic and write the supporting ideas though few points are still too general/abstract/vague.

Meanwhile, the students' average score in *organization* is 2.98. This is the lowest score in this table and from this score it can be acknowledged that the students have not been able to focus on the main idea while writing hortatory exposition and sometimes their writing has more than one idea; unwell-organized and unwell-elaborated.

As *sentence and formatting usage* score is 3.32, it points out, therefore, that the students generally have used standard word order even though there are some jumbled words. In addition, some mistakes in the students' writing also can be found in tense, article, pronoun, and preposition.

Furthermore, in the *vocabulary and style* indicator, the students' average score is 3.5. This is the second higher score according to the table demonstrated above. This score finally confirms that the vocabulary used by the students in writing hortatory exposition is still less precise and the information is also less purposeful.

Last but not least, in *mechanic* indicator; the students' average score for this indicator is 3.49, meaning that the students generally have almost used effective capitalization, punctuation, spelling and formatting. Even if there is any error, it does not detract from meaning.

After all, from the table shown above, it can be inferred that the students did the best in *vocabulary and style* indicator as the students' writing can reach 3.51 which it is the highest score of all. On the other hand, the students still encountered some problems in writing supporting sentences and this existing weakness is categorized as *organization* indicator. In this indicator, the students' score is 2.98 and it is categorized as the lowest score of all.

**CONCLUSION**

The title of this research is "The Ability of Eleventh Grade Students Writing Hortatory Exposition Text at MAN 1 Pekanbaru" which aims to find out the ability of eleventh grade students of MAN 1 Pekanbaru in writing hortatory exposition. The ability of writing in hortatory exposition is important to have particularly for the eleventh grade students since as one of argumentative texts, writing hortatory exposition text can train the students to think critically and this ability of critical thinking will be beneficial for the students in doing and dealing with their activities inside and outside the school such as: discussing, presenting, writing, or even talking to their friends.

After doing the research, the writer found that the eleventh grade students' ability of MAN 1 Pekanbaru in the Academic Year 2015/2016 is in *fair* level (68.41). According to the students' writing scores in each indicator, it was discovered that the easiest indicator is *vocabulary and style* and the most difficult one is *organization*.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The writer wants to address some recommendations to the characters related to this research. First, it is better for the school to equally and simultaneously concern in promoting everyone or students, in particular, both to speak and to write in English especially writing hortatory exposition text. Second, if the students make mistakes in writing, it is necessary for the teachers not only to give score but also to let the students know where their mistakes are in order to avoid repetition of the same mistakes in further writing. Last but not least, the students are recommended to practice writing outside the school by themselves or with their peers because the time allocation for writing class is limited.

## REFERENCES

- Alves, A. R. 2008. *Process Writing*. The University of Birmingham. England.
- Anas Sudijono. 2012. *Pengantar Statistik Pendidikan: Thwenty Fourth Edition*. PT Rajagrafindo Persada. Jakarta.
- Anita Triastuti. (n.d). *Critical Issues in the Implementation of Genre-Based Teaching*. Unpublished. Yogyakarta State University.
- Atik Riana. 2011. *A Study on the Ability of the First Year Students of MTS Darel Hikmah in Writing Procedure Text*. Unpublished. University of Riau. Pekanbaru.
- Boyd, N. (n.d). *Argumentative Essay: Definition, Format & Examples*. (online). <http://study.com/academy/lesson/argumentative-essay-definition-format-examples.html>. (retrieved in August, 2016).
- Brown, H.D. 2000. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. Longman. California.
- Budi Setyono. 2014. *Basic and Applied Research (IJSBAR)*. *International Journal of Sciences*. (online). <http://gssrr.org/index.php?journalOfBasicAndApplied>. (retrieved in August 26<sup>th</sup>, 2016).



- Byrne, D. 1988. *Teaching Writing Skill: Longman Handbooks for Writing Teachers*. New Edition. Longman. London and New York.
- Chandler, D. 1997. *An Introduction to Genre Theory*. <http://www.aber.ac.uk/media/Documents/integenre/chandlergenretheory.pdf>. (online). (retrieved in August 29th, 2016).
- Coffin, C. 2004. Arguing about How the World is or How the World Should be: the Role of Argument in IELTS Test. *Journal for Academic Purposes. The Open University, UK*. (online). open.ac.uk. (retrieved in August 8<sup>th</sup>, 2016).
- Curriculum Planning and Research Division.(2001). *English Language Syllabus 2001. For Primary and Secondary School*. Singapore: Ministry of Education.
- Depdiknas. 2005. *Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 19 Tahun 2005 Tentang Standar Nasional Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Depdiknas Republik Indonesia.
- Derewianka, B. 2003. *Trend and Issues in Genre Based Approach: RELC Journal*.Sage.
- Dewa Komang Tantra.(n.d). *Teaching English as A Foreign Language in Indonesia: A Literature Review*. Education University of Ganesha Singaraja.Bali.
- Dewey, J. 1910. *How We Think*. Library of Alexandria. Alexandria Egypt.
- Gay, L. R. 2000. *Educational Research Competencies for Analysis and Application*. USA: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Gerot, L. and P. Wignell. 1995. *Making Sense of Functional Grammar*. Cammeray NSW: Gerd Stabler.
- Handley, A. 2013.9 *Qualities of Good Writing*. annhandley.com. (online). (retrieved in August 28<sup>th</sup>, 2016).
- Harmer, J. 2004. *How to Teach Writing*. Pearson Longman. England.
- Harris, D. P. 1974. *Testing English as A Second Language*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Hartono, R. 2005. *Genre-Based Writing.English*.Department Faculty of Language and Art.Semarang State University.

- Hatch and Farhady. 1982. 1982. *Research Design And Statistics of Applied Linguistics*. Massachussets: New Burry. House Publisher.
- Hillocks, G. 2010. *Teaching Argument for Critical Thinking and Writing*. The University of Chicago. Illinois USA. (online). [www.ncte.org](http://www.ncte.org). (online). (retrieved in August 2016).
- Hughes, A., 1993. *Testing for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hyland, K. 1990. *A Genre Description of Argumentative Essay*. SAGE Publications PNG University of Technology Lae. Papua New Guinea.
- Iedema, R., Feez, S. and White, P. R. R. 1995. *Media Literacy: Write it Right Industry Research Report vol. II*, Sydney: Metropolitan East Disadvantaged Schools Program, NSW Department of School Education.
- Machalla M.A Megaiab. 2014. The English writing Competence of the Students of Indonesian Senior High School. *The 2014 WEI International Academic Conference Proceedings*. Bali, Indonesia. [www.westeasinstitute.com](http://www.westeasinstitute.com). (online). (retrieved in 26th August, 2016).
- Martin, J. R. 1989. *Factual Writing: exploring and challenging social reality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nana Syaodih Sukmadinata. 2011. *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan*. Kerjasama Antara Program Pascasarjana UPI dengan PT Remaja Rosdakarya Offset. Bandung.
- Nunan, D. 1999. *Second Language Teaching and Learning*. Heinle ELT.
- Sherli Agustine. 2012. *Teaching Writing Hortatory Exposition Through Outlining at the Eleventh Grade of Sman 3 Banjarmasin Academic Year 2011/2012*. Unpublished. University of Lambung Mengkurat. Banjarmasin.
- Suharsimi Arikunto. 2006. *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu pendekatan Praktik*. Rineka Cipta. Jakarta.
- Sukardi. 2003. *Metodologi Penelitian Pendidikan*. Bumi Aksara. Yogyakarta.
- Sydarwati&Eudia Grace. 2006. *Look Ahead 2 for Senior High School Students Year XI*. Erlangga. Jakarta.